

The Celtic Magazine.

EDITED BY

ALEXANDER MACBAIN, M.A., F.S.A. Scot.

No. CXXXVIII.

APRIL, 1887.

VOL. XII.

MACPHERSON'S OSSIAN.

III.

WE have considered the history, the manners and customs, and the mythology of Macpherson's "Ossian": it now remains to determine the amount of authenticity there is in his work—his relation to our genuine heroic literature as contained in the ballads and tales, the style of his verse, and the character of his language. Incidentally, we shall discuss the evidence of Blair's correspondents and others—evidence which has been thought so conclusively to prove the authenticity of his work, but which we shall discover to prove the opposite.

The researches of philology and modern criticism into ancient Irish literature, with the consequent light thrown on early Celtic history and life, have illumined the darkness of the Ossianic problem so far that among Celtic scholars the question is settled already. Nor has Scotland been idle in lending her quota of proof. The publication in 1860 of Campbell's "Popular Tales," followed in 1862 by the Dean of Lismore's Book, began the proper study of our native stores of heroic and popular literature; and the appearance in 1872 of Campbell's "Leabhar na Feinne," wherein all the ballad literature of Gaelic Scotland, as found in MSS. of the last century, and in the older printed collections, then scarce and rare as now, was gathered together in handy form, was the next and most important step of all in settling the literary history of the Scottish Gael and the Ossianic question. The Book of the Dean of Lismore, which is dated about 1512, contains

30 Ossianic pieces, 9 of which are ascribed to Ossian himself—"A houdir so Ossin," 2 to Fergus his brother, 1 each to Caoilte and Conall Cernach, while 4 important ones—Fraoch, Conloch, Diarmat, and a version of Gabhra Battle—are attributed to unknown authors, who, however, would appear to have belonged to near the Dean's own time. Eleven or twelve pieces are ascribed to no author. Last century collections were published in 1782-3 by Hill in the *Gentleman's Magazine*—half-a-dozen leading ballads; in 1784, by Bishop Young in the Royal Irish Academy Transactions—seven ballads; in 1786, at Perth by Gillies, the most important collection of last century, numbering about twenty; in 1804 by the Stewarts, and in 1816 by the MacCallums. The important MS. collections of last century made by Pope, MacNicol, Fletcher, Kennedy, and Irvine were published in Mr. Campbell's "Leabhar na Feinne" in 1872. In short, we have a right to believe that we have copies, perhaps not so good, of absolutely all the Ossianic poetry that Macpherson collected. We know that he had some of the very ballads we now have, for he mentions or quotes them, of course dubbing them as "Irish" and non-Ossianic. We have evidence of two kinds to prove that he got several others; first, some of Blair's correspondents and others gave him ballads, and, secondly, he founds in a dozen instances on the ballad story, though the superstructure is his own.

The authorship of the ballads is unknown. Most of them, such as Manus, Ossian's Prayer, Diarmat, Gabhra and Essroy, are Irish as well as Scotch; indeed, they are claimed as Irish exclusively by the Irish Gaels, and in some cases it is hard to rebut the claim. The earliest form of Goidelic literature, that is of the literature common to the Gael of early Ireland and Scotland, was prose narrative interspersed with pieces of poetry, the poetry being a summary of the narrative, or a speech said or sung by one of the characters, or a lyric outburst by some one in the story. In our ballads, the narrative has also become poetry, a fact which shows their lateness. Indeed, the date of the 15th century so freely given to them as the period of their composition last century by Macpherson, Shaw, and the other critics, seems near the truth. It certainly is fairly true in the case of the ballads of Norse invasions, such as that of Manus; for the historic King

Manus or Magnus Barefoot fell in 1103, and a century or two would be necessary to get him embattled against the mythic Fionn and his men in the minds of a forgetful posterity. The ballads are dateless, and they are also anonymous. Poets and bards were numerous, but they were a guild in which the work of the individual was not individually claimed. A poet may be introduced in a prose narrative as saying or singing the verses following, but it cannot be supposed, by us at least, that this poet composed the piece so said or sung. Cuchulinn, Fionn, Ossian, and the heroes generally, recite such poetry on the spur of the moment. In the later Middle-Ages, this style degenerated into those colloquies we have in our ballads between Ossian and Patrick, where the heathen and the Christian argue the salvation of the *Feinne*, and thereafter Ossian tells a tale in verse of the exploits of the *Feinne*. But it is not to be imagined for a moment that such a dialogue could be authentic; if so, Patrick must be responsible for his share of the dialogue. The anonymous poet alone is responsible for his stage puppets. The Dean of Lismore is really the first in Irish and Gaelic literature that attributes the authorship of the poetry to the mere character of the story who says or sings it; and most of his pieces are clearly detached episodes in a tale partly prose, partly poetry. Still separate poems sung or said by Fenian heroes do exist older than the Dean of Lismore. In the *Book of Leinster*, a MS. of the 12th century, there are 5 detached poems which Fionn and 3 which Ossian sang (*cecinit*); while a MS. of the 14th century gives 2 poems to Fionn, 1 to Fergus, and 1 to Caoilte. What made Ossian so popularly famous as a poet was the myth which sprung up connecting him with St. Patrick, to whom in his old age he was represented as telling these tales. The poetic scenes between Ossian and Patrick became very popular, and Macpherson, in an unfortunate hour, jumped to the conclusion that here was a great poet of antiquity—a Homer, in fact, of the Gael, and immediately the whole world resounded with the old hero's name, though he was no more a poet, nor perhaps less so, than any of his heroic companions.

Macpherson's verse-construction is egregiously wrong. Early Goidelic, and also Celtic poetry, was thus constructed: Every line must have a fixed number of syllables; the last word must be a

rhyme-word corresponding to one in the next line or in the third line. These rhymes bound the verse into couplets or into quatrains. Alliteration, as well as rhyme, played an important part; but accent or stress, as in modern Gaelic and English poetry, had no place at all. Our ballads are in quatrains with rhyme of alternate lines, as a rule; there are four feet, measured not by syllables but by the accent, though there are signs that some of the ballads originally were composed without regard to accent but merely with the old fixed number of syllables in each line. Rhymed quatrains of eight-syllable lines are the characteristic of our Gaelic heroic poetry. Let us see how Macpherson does. His line varies in length, but the average is eight syllables or four accents; the verse is properly blank, though quatrains are numerous. Truly might the grammarians describe the metre of Ossian as irregular when it is nothing more nor less than poetic or measured prose! Indeed, his English could almost go into similar lines of similar length. Now, why this measure or rather this no-measure? Firstly, it is easy and fits his poetic and measured English prose. Secondly, Macpherson aimed again at the antique and landed in sham-antique; for he clearly thought, from the researches of Dr. Lowth into Hebrew poetry, that such a style was the primitive one. Here, again, his divinity studies bewray him. Thirdly, he had an idea that rhyme was a modern invention. "The versification in the original is simple," the preface to the *Fragments* of 1760 says. "Rhyme is seldom used; but the cadence and the length of the line varied so as to suit the sense." Nothing could be more untrue, for Celtic poetry was rigidly inflexible in its rules of metre; but Macpherson practised what he preached. He did not know that rhyme is old in Celtic—that probably the Celts gave rhyme to modern literature. As a consequence, his Gaelic "Original" is merely poetic prose—a halt between the Hebrew Psalms and Pope's rhymes—with good quatrains stuck amidst wastes of prose to remind us of "what might have been" if Macpherson knew better. The mere structure of his verse is enough to prove spuriousness.

The heroic ballads have been very unfairly treated by defenders of Macpherson's work. Macpherson himself treated them in his 1763 preface as Irish and non-Ossianic; we might expect

that. But the Highland Society of Edinburgh regarded them in the light of "corrupt copies," Macpherson's being of course the true Ossian. This Society published its famous Report in 1805, two years before the Gaelic of 1807 was published, and, as a consequence, they worked in the dark as to what Gaelic to expect. The Gaelic patchwork they gave for "Fingal," and that only in part, picked as it was in lines and passages from all sorts of ballads on all or any subjects, does not agree in a single line with Macpherson's Gaelic, and is wide enough of his English, as wide of it, indeed, as Laing's "patchwork of plagiarism" in the foot-notes to his Ossian. Dr. Clerk, in his 1870 edition, says of the ballads: "They are very inferior to the Collections of Macpherson and Smith, and cannot for a moment be referred to the same authorship." Exactly so; and yet he quotes the evidence of Blair's correspondents and the Highland Society's Report in favour of the authenticity of Macpherson, although both, in their evidence, refer to the ballads as we now have them! Macpherson and Clerk reject the very basis of the much vaunted evidence—the testimony of a cloud of witnesses—in declaring the ballads non-Ossianic.

We know that the correspondents of Blair in 1763 and of the Highland Society refer to the ballads which we now have and not to Macpherson's Gaelic of 1807. Gallie and Ferguson quote lines from "Manus," which we have, in testimony of parts of "Fingal." Others again refer to the ballads by name as Gaelic representing the English in some parts. And again the passages in Macpherson's English which most of them say they heard and knew in Gaelic are exactly those that our ballads suit; and the correspondents, as we should expect, often qualify their statements thus:—"Battle of Lora, nearly"; Temora, Bk. I., "much the same from pages 172 to 190"; 3 pages of Fingal IV. "without any material variation"; Darthula, "155 pretty well to the end of 171"; Fingal IV., where the chiefs select opponents, "pretty entire"; the "Battle of Lena in Fingal II. is still preserved by tradition in this country; but with this variation that the proposal of giving up his wife and dog in page 26, was made by Magnus, King of Lochlin, to Fingal, and not by Swaran to Cuchulinn"—a sentence which pretty well shows the spirit and the accuracy

with which the correspondents compared Macpherson's work with the ballads. Shaw visited some of these correspondents in 1778, and personally ascertained that it was these "15th century" ballads that were meant. Nothing is clearer than that the evidence refers to our ballads and not to Macpherson's Ossian at all—refers moreover to only a small part of a very large work. What on earth is the value of this evidence when such is the case? Indeed, it goes to prove want of authenticity, for the ballads and Macpherson's work are of very different authorship.

Macpherson's "Ossian" agrees more or less vaguely in incidents and sometimes in names with the ballads in the following places: (1) Cuchulinn at Tara in the opening of Fingal with the ballad of Garbh Mac Starn, slightly and for only a verse or two; (2) Cuchulinn's war-chariot—the general idea is similar, but the Gaelic differs widely; (3) the ballad of Manus corresponds to parts in Fingal II., IV., and V.; the ballad, like Fingal, tells of a Lochlin invasion, and describes the armies, banners, and fight, but nothing more; (4) the episode of Ferda in Fingal II. is founded on the story of the most famous of Celtic "epics," the Tain Bo Chuailgne; (5) the Agandecca episode in Fingal III. corresponds faintly to the ballad of "Cromgleann" (MacCallums); (6) the ballad of Essroy corresponds fairly well with the episode in the end of Fingal III. known as Fainesoluis; so too (7) does the Courtship of Evir to the beginning of Fingal IV.; (8) the ballad of Earragon corresponds to the expansion of it in Macpherson's "Battle of Lora"; (9) the Deirdre ballad corresponds poorly with the epic Darthula; (10) the Cuchulinn and Conloch ballad agrees distantly in plot, but not in names, with "Carthon"; (11) Cath Gabhra corresponds to the death of Oscar in Temora I.; and (12) the lamentation of Dargo's wife agrees but little with Macpherson's version (in a note to "Calthon and Colmal"), for he dwells on the wife's loss and loneliness, whereas the true ballad dwells on the personal and physical qualities of Dargo, as usual. These are really all the passages that can bear any resemblance to each other in the present ballads and in Macpherson's work. Besides these, Blair's correspondents added one or two more, which cannot be recognised in the ballads: the episode of Orla in Fingal V.; parts of Inishona, Lathmon, Berrathon, and the Connal episode of

Carric-thura. Sir John Macpherson recognises the address to the evening star in the "Songs of Selma," but, as he adds that the "copy or edition he had of this poem is very different from mine," no value can be attached to it. Sir John's war-song of Ullin is doubtless Rosg Ghuill, but it requires a stretch of imagination to compare it to Ullin's "urging" of Gaul in Fingal IV.

It will be observed that the Addresses to the Sun are not referred to in 1763; they were unknown then. Captain Morrison, one of Macpherson's friends, who helped him as amanuensis, got copies of those addresses and gave them to friends. Rev. Mr. Macdiarmid, of Weem, declared in 1801 that he got them thirty years before (say 1770) from an old man in Glenlyon, who heard them in his youth. But Macdiarmid is thoroughly untrustworthy, for at the same time he sent to the Highland Society a piece called "Leaba Ghuil," which he got from a man who got it from a man who heard it in his youth. This piece was nothing else than a *literatim et verbatim* copy of a Gaelic note in Smith's Gaelic Antiquities, published in 1780. The piece is Smith's own; the mythic name Strumon (a mere fabrication), the Macphersonic ghosts and the Macphersonic blank verse prove that. And Smith changed it again in the 1787 edition, leaving out Strumon. The language of the Addresses points the same way, and so do the ideas. Besides, addresses to sun, stars, and natural objects do not exist in Irish or Gaelic ancient literature. Malvina's Dream appeared in Gaelic in 1778 in Shaw's grammar; it is the beginning of Macpherson's "Croma." It appears that Macpherson gave the Gaelic to Lord Kames, and then Shaw got it. Shaw does not say who gave it to him. "Briathran Fhinn ri Oscar" is given by Gillies in 1786; it is the introduction to the episode of Fainesoluis in Fingal III. It is thoroughly Macphersonic, even to its being almost measured prose; indeed, Macpherson left it as one original along with the unauthorised original for Fainesoluis. And, further, it shows the mark of the beast in the name Trathal, the Macphersonic grandfather of Fingal, who is a mere invention of Macpherson's own. Macpherson's poem of "Conloch and Cuthon" is given in Macpherson's Gaelic in Stewarts' Collection, but the Stewarts were engaged on the 1807 edition of the Gaelic, and doubtless got it from Macpherson's papers. In the Stewarts'

ballad of Clan Usnich, or Darthula, there are many marks of editing; first, mixed with the old ballad, are translations of Macpherson's Darthula, extending from verses 29 to 60; secondly, Deirdre's lament is corrected by the light of a sixteenth century MS., and the very misreadings of Ewen Maclachlan are reproduced. Work like this can hardly be called anything else than dishonest. The Gaelic passages, published in 1780 by Dr. Smith as notes to his English, seem to have been, in the fierce dispute over Macpherson's Ossian, greedily swallowed by the Highland public, for not merely Macdiarmid but the MacCallums were imposed on. MacCallums' "Morglan and Min-fhonn" is but one absurd assortment of the Gaelic notes in Smith's 1780 work. They appear in Smith at pages 145, 173, 247, 248, 249. The "Colg-shuil" of the same collection is from Smith's Antiquities also, and the address to the setting sun combines both Macpherson's and Smith's. As J. F. Campbell says, there is not a line of Macpherson's Gaelic in the ballads, or indeed older than himself, and all the Gaelic that corresponds exactly to his English can be traced to himself through his friends.

The Gaelic which Macpherson writes is very modern; in fact, it is more than modern, for he has too often been able to manufacture a language of his own. Its fancied antiquity is caused by its unusual character; firstly, by its enigmatical and elliptical style, and secondly, by its undoubted originality of expression, an originality which takes the boldest liberties with the grammar and rhetoric of the language. These liberties are distinctly bad Gaelic; yet because they are in "Ossian," and "Ossian" must be old, good Gaelic critics like Dr. Clerk pass them over as "different from what obtains in modern Gaelic," fancying this use of the words to belong to a hoar antiquity. Macpherson's departures from modern Gaelic grammar and style are not survivals from antiquity; they are the bold errors of an imperious intellect, which, like the King of the Romans, rose superior to grammar. Dr. Clerk, therefore, unwittingly passes a heavy condemnation on Macpherson's Gaelic when he advances as proofs of antiquity the following characteristics:—"There is," he says, "a remarkable absence of secondary or subsidiary words, of pronouns, prepositions, and conjunctions; generally instead of an adjective qualifying

a noun, we have two nouns in regimen : the same word is used in an extraordinary variety of different meanings—homonymy, as the linguists call it ; and there is an almost utter disregard of inflections whether of nouns or of verbs as there is also of the present order of syntax." Except the first statement as to the absence of particles, which is natural in poetry, all the other statements are fatal, not merely to the antiquity of the language, but to its modern accuracy. The use of nouns for adjectives and the disregard of inflections are especially fatal, for they are signs of very advanced decay. Macpherson's knowledge of Gaelic was bookish rather than native ; the Gaelic of the ballads and the MSS. he gathered gave him words and phrases, and this, with his native store, he transfused with Anglo-Classicalism and boldness of metaphoric language. That he gave some attention to the writing and spelling of the language, the 7th Book of Temora shows, and it shows, too, his knowledge of Irish orthography.

Each line of his Gaelic verse, as a rule, stands independent of the others, and many of these independent lines have no predication at all, save, perhaps, a participial infinitive, as in *Cath-Loduinn* I. 11. Only the man who asked MacCodrum, "A bheil dad agad air an Fheinn ?" could perpetrate this line :—

Tha mi grad air do shluagh fo lainn (Tem. VI. 215).

This is how a boy turns his ear to a sound :—

Tionndaidh e 'chluasan 'na cheann (He turns his ears in his head.)—Tem. III. 155.

Well might Dr. Clerk call this "a most remarkable expression, which, so far as I know, stands alone as descriptive of an effort to catch a sound." We hope so. On Macpherson's ten thousand two hundred lines of Gaelic Dr. Clerk has written some five hundred and ten marginal notes, most of which are in reality explanations of, or apologies for, what is but bad Gaelic. These notes average five for each hundred lines, and, making allowance for those of the notes that are not explanatory of bad idiom, we may set down three errors in every hundred lines as Dr. Clerk's average of errors explained away, or, more rarely, animadverted upon. And he has not noted half of the errors. We may accept it as fairly true that Macpherson has some error of grammar, idiom or composition on the average in every twenty or twenty-five lines.

Here are a few of his gems, and it will be noted how many of the lines are absolutely meaningless :—

Bha 'shiubhal gun mheirg gu mhac (Cath Lo. III., 41).

Bha 'n raon fo thuiteam nan triath (Carric. 390).

Bha 'shleagh an cunnart nach mall (Ib., 427).

An samhchair nach b 'fhaoin le cheile (Ib., 459).

Theich air raon nan cruadalach gnìomh (Car., 43).

Og a dh' imich a thriall do Mhaona (Ib., 107).

Cha mhall na bliadhna 's cumhachd triall (Ib., 177).

Ainnir àillidh rosg mall gun ghruaim (Oigh., 110).

Tha sòlas am fial a' bhàis (Ib., 162).

A' tilleadh mu rosg nam bliadhna (Gaol., 56).

Shoillsich Carull measg aois a chiabh (Ib. 74).

Air dubh-dhruim nan leum air sàil (Ib., 121).

Og ruighe gun mheirg lag fo sgeith (Croma, 147).

Nuair thig dàna nam focal treuna (Cal., 166).

Namhaid beumnach cuain nan dàimh (Fin. I., 268).

Olla ruadh nam brosnachadh dàna (Tem. I., 263).

Gu deireadh lanna blàir is arm (Ib. II., 88).

Leth-aomta chaochail i chruaidh (Ib. VI., 53).

Bha 'cheuman beumadh gu h-àrd (Ib., 273).

Gun fhios do leum riabhach nan ruadh (Ib., 303).

Nuair shin Calmar a bhàs air sliabh (Ib., 346).

B'e toil-sa 's an tràth fo ghruaim (Ib., 405).

Mosguil bard focuil a scaoin (Tem. VII., 134, 1st Ed.).

Sheal i o bristigh a ceil (Ib., 396).

Whole passages where errors and obscurities exist may be found, among others, at Cath-Lo. I. 175-180, III. 10-14; Oigh. 109-112; Cal. 163-166; and Tem. II. 484-489, III. 102-134, both "very obscure," as Dr. Clerk says. Cath-Loduim is obscure throughout—a series of jagged, disconnected lines, but Temora runs it hard for the worst Gaelic. Fingal, on the other hand, contains much excellent Gaelic.

The following Anglo-Classicalisms may be noted out of many such :—

Ghluais àrdan a làmh ri a shleagh (Cath-Lo. I., 20).

An còmhrag a' snàmh air a ghnuis (Car., 224).

Innis da 'sa' chòmhrag ar brìgh (Ib., 271).

Lan mhìle "triath," thuit sgeimh na h-oigh (Cal., 123).

Thug e ghorm lann dha debir (Fin. I., 273).

Dh' imich cruadal siol na h-Èrinn (Ib., 220).

The use of abstract nouns for the concrete, as above, is common. He uses some pet words in two diametrically opposite

meanings, one of which only is known to proper Gaelic (Clerk's homonymy): *daimh* (relationship, foes!), *clí* (strength, weak), *sinnsire* (ancestry, posterity). He uses well-known words in meanings peculiar to himself—*tùr*(?), *meirg*, (*gu*) *trian*(?), (*gu*) *cùl*, *osna* (for *osag*, only in *Tem. VII*). What is "*toirne*?" He abuses and misuses good words, such as *stuaadh*, *siol*, *cruach*, *leac*, *triuir* (*Tim. VI. 353*), *fraoch*, *luaidh*, *faoin*, *corr*, *gu h-àrd*, *suas*. He works to death words of motion like *siubhal*, *aomadh*, and *iadh*; ships, planets, storms, and ghosts "walk" (*siubhal*). Nouns appear as adjectives and as verbs, quite contrary to idiom; for example, *sounding* and *mourning* appear as "*a' fuaim*, *a' bròin*." Adjectives are persistently used as nouns: *dearg* and *ruadh* (deer), *liath* (old man), *crom* (circle), *geur* (sharpness), *tlàth* (warmth), and many others. His continued inversions, especially in placing the adjective before the noun, and particularly before the genitive plural, and his new-fangled compounds, which remind us of the weak translations from German of our time, are all distinctly unidiomatic, caused by thinking in the English language and translating into Gaelic.

Philology also is strongly against Macpherson. Of his seventeen hundred Gaelic words, between fifty and sixty are certainly borrowed, and nearly as many more are doubtful, though probably borrowed. Some very common words in his pages are borrowed—*càs*, *clis*, *cunntas*(!), *focal*, *obair*, *òr*, *sòlas*, *stad*, *stailinn*, *steud*, *stoirn*, *strìth*, *talla*, *uair*. The idea which Dr. Clerk had that the Gaelic belonged to the pre-inflection stage of the language is opposed to all philologic science. Indeed, we can with fair accuracy restore the language in which Ossian would have composed the poetry, if he lived in the third century of our era. The literary language of that age appears on the Ogam monuments and was nearly as highly inflected as the Latin of the time, the inflection—declension and conjugation—being of exactly the same type as Latin. Now, Macpherson's Gaelic is marked by an "utter disregard of inflections." Even should Ossian have composed poetry in the 3d century, and it had been handed down orally till last century, it would be very unlike Macpherson's revolutionary Gaelic; it might however be very like the Gaelic of the ballads, for traditional poetry does change gradually to suit the

successive ages, still retaining archaic traces in words, inflections and ideas.

Which is the translation, the Gaelic or the English? The Gaelic is the translation. Or rather, we should say the English was first written, and thereafter Gaelic poetry on the same subject was written, closely following the English in general plot and idea. The Gaelic, in fact, is a paraphrase of the English. Mr. John Mackenzie naively records in his diary that in 1784 (?), while visiting Macpherson, the latter told him he had been putting together the Gaelic of Berrathon; "that he had only put together a few lines of it, and these not to his liking; that he had tired of it after a short sitting." This occurred about the time that the thousand pounds were subscribed to induce and enable Macpherson to publish the Gaelic original. Likely most of the Gaelic that now exists was "put together" then and afterwards, a fact which will account for his procrastination in the matter of publishing it. He probably wished to write Gaelic for the whole of his Ossianic English, but this he never accomplished. The only Gaelic he published himself was the 7th Book of Temora in 1763; it is a poor piece of work, whether English or Gaelic, but it shows that he had given some attention to orthography. A slip or two on Macpherson's part enables us to decide conclusively whether Gaelic or English was first. In the 1763 volume he gives in a note to Book VIII. of Temora, three lines of Gaelic original. The English is thus: "They (our ghostly fathers) are darkened moons in heaven, which send the fire of night red-wandering over their face." The note gives this as the original for it:—

" Mar dhubh-reùil, an croma nan speur,
A thaomas teina na h' oicha,
Dearg-sruthach air h' aghai' fein."

The 1773 edition did not repeat this note, and Macpherson in doing the work consecutively—evidently after that date—overlooked this note, and the Gaelic in the published Ossian is (lines 383-5):—

" Mar rè iad an dubhra nan speur,
Tha 'trusadh tein-oidhche m' a gruaidh,
Dearg sheachran air 'eudan gun tuar."

Two renderings of the same English could hardly be more different. In a note to Carthon on the expression "restless

wanderer of the heath," Macpherson says: "The word in the original here rendered by *restless wanderer* is *scuta*, which is the true origin of the *Scotti*." Would it be believed that no such word appears in our present original? The translation is, "Fear-astar nan gleann gun raon." Curiously Macpherson of Strathmashie gave a Macphersonic rendering of Fingal III. 259-276, which he handed to the Rev. Mr. Gallie, who in turn gave it to the Highland Society. It appears in their Report (p. 32), but unfortunately it does not agree with Macpherson's Gaelic in anything save in style and meaning.

How much authenticity has Macpherson's work? The Gaelic is all his own, and is a generous paraphrase of the English. His 1763 volume is all a fabrication of his own—all save part of Bk. I. of Temora. The volume includes these poems: Temora, Cath-Loda, Cathlin of Clutha, Sullmalla of Lumon, Oina-morul, and Colnandona. Bk. I. of Temora was published in 1762, and the rest of the epic was then declared by implication to be lost. Of the 1762 volume, Comala, War of Caros, Conlath and Cuthon, Death of Cuchulinn, Carric-thura, Calthon and Colmal, Oithona, Songs of Selma, and Croma have no counterparts in the tales and ballads. They are Macpherson's own. That is, seven-thirteenths of the whole Ossianic poetry is Macpherson's own absolutely. We may regard also as his, though some of Blair's correspondents thought they recognised known pieces inserted in them, War of Inishona, Lathmon, and Berrathon. This makes five-eighths of the work Macpherson's own. Darthula, Carthon, the Battle of Lora, and about half of the first book of Temora are more or less founded on ballad stories. They form a seventh of the whole work. Fingal, which forms over a fifth of the Ossianic poetry of Macpherson, has a plot similar to the ballad of Manus, and embodies the plots of about half-a-dozen other ballads. The Highland Society compared every available scrap of ballad with the Fingal, with this result: the patchwork extends to 782 lines; Fingal, in Gaelic, to 3196; the proportion is therefore 1 to 4. This pitches the proportion of authentic basis too high; but it shows, along with the fact that Macpherson is very wide of the ballads in the parts compared, that on the whole the Fingal is Macpherson's original work; its execution and its epic form are certainly so,

and we may add its plot as well. The Fingal is about as much Macpherson's own as Milton's Paradise Lost is Milton's. Macpherson's relation to the ballads and their story is on a par with Milton's relation to the Bible and tradition. He did not, like Tennyson, merely give a new and modern rendering of old tales and ballads. Scarcely a third of his whole Ossianic work has any authentic counterpart, such as it is, in the ballads. The rest is absolutely his own work. In fact, the ballads cannot count seriously in our estimate of Macpherson as a poet. His "Ossian" is as truly his own work as ever that of any great poet has been the work of that poet. "Make the part of what is turgid, modern, tawdry, spurious, in the book as large as you please," as Matthew Arnold says, "there will still be left a residue with the very soul of the Celtic genius in it, and which has the proud distinction of having brought this soul of the Celtic genius into contact with the genius of the nations of modern Europe, and enriched all our poetry by it. Woody Morven and echoing Lora and Selma with its silent halls! We owe them a debt of gratitude, and when we are unjust enough to forget it, may the Muse forget us!" In these papers we have vindicated the character of our genuine heroic and ballad literature, and, though this has been done at the expense of Macpherson's character, his genius stands forth with all the greater brilliance; we are enabled to appreciate and admire his work with genuine confidence apart from the spurious halo of a supposed antiquity; and we are further enabled to pay more respect, hitherto too scanty, to those ballads and tales that are the genuine heirloom of our race.

SNATCHES OF SONG COLLECTED IN BADENOCH.

V.

Lights and Shadows of the Croft would form the appropriate title of a large collection of Gaelic lyrics. Such a hold had poetry upon their imagination, that Highlanders liked to set to music all matters which occupied their thoughts. Not only have Love, War, the Chase, the Clan, the Chief, received a place in song; we find that even the ordinary events of every-day life reflect their humour or pathos in the ballads of the people. It is unfortunate that so little has been done to rescue from oblivion those simple strains which are so closely associated with the manners and customs of bygone time. When the more important collections of Gaelic poetry were made, the public taste demanded other material which we have had in abundance. Probably no district in the North could have afforded a more interesting field for the collector of popular rhymes than Badenoch in the beginning of this century. If it produced no great bards, except "Ossian" and "Fear Strath-mhathashaidh," it gave birth to numberless, though often nameless, song-makers. But the changes which have greatly affected other parts of the Highlands, even within the last fifteen years, have had their full effect in Badenoch. Old people have died, and with them many of the tales and ballads of a past age; so that it is now difficult, and soon it will be impossible, to come in contact with even such "snatches" as the writer of these papers took down from recitation a dozen years ago. So much by way of introduction. And now to proceed with the matter in hand.

It is the best part of a century since Malcolm Macintyre, better known as Callum Dubh nam Proiteagain [Black Callum of the tricks], was resident at Brae-Ruthven, on the Duke of Gordon's property, near Kingussie. He had been a soldier—probably in America. After the wars he returned to his native country, and supported himself and his family by wandering about and exhibiting a "Punch and Judy show." He also

practised the art of jugglery, and hence his sobriquet. Altogether a curious character. He composed two poems on the "Loss of Gaick;" both of which have been printed. They contain some very beautiful passages. The verses which I give below were addressed by him to his wife before their marriage:—

Anna dhonn agam fhéin,
Tha mi trom a do dheigh;
Bidh mo shùil anns gach àit,
Dh' fheuch co dha bheir thu speis.

Ma 's e figheadar do rùn,
'S gur ann air tha do shùil;
Feuch nach pòs thu fear breun,
Chumas deur air do shùil.

Cha-n' eil càs idir ann,
Ged robh càch orm gann;
Gheibh sinn fearann ri nar beo,
Bho Dhiùc Gordan air gleann.

When a young man in such position—a crofter's son—received a promise of land from the "Good Duke," and was about to get married, *he* set about to collect the necessary outfit, or trousseau—which means just *trusadh*. He forthwith proceeded upon what was called the *Faoighe-shaoghair*; in accordance with the custom of the time, to gather from his neighbours such gifts and gear as might enable him to set up in life. Some one burlesqued the custom, as we see:—

"Thèid mi air an Fhaoighe-shoghair."
Arsa Giorral Ghiongam.
"Le m' each, le m' ghille, is le m' theadhair."
Arsa Giorral Ghiongam
"Gheibh mi adag as na ceithir."
Arsa Giorral Ghiongam.
"S bheir na mnathan dhomh an t-im."
Arsa Giorral Ghiongam.
"Mar sud is an càis' cruinn, buidhe."
Arsa Giorral Ghiongam.

This is the rhyme without repetitions. The party from whom I received it naively added that any bridegroom who got two sheaves could not complain.

Crofts do not always pay! So experienced the impoverished, but waggish crofter, who sang this doleful ditty:—

Goirtean nam Broighleag,
Sgiot e mo theaghlach,
Chuir e mo chòinneamh,
B' fhaide na 'm iùl.
Dh' fhalbh an damh bànn,
'S dh' fhalbh an damh riobhach,
Dh' fhalbh iad uile,
Bho 'n theirig am biadh dhaibh ;
Goirtean na dunaich,
Tur chunnaic mi riamh e,
Goirtean nam Broighleag,
Thachair e rium.

Goirtean nam Broighleag,
Agus Fear Eadarais,
Thachair iad rium,
'S gun thachair mo theic rium
Dh' fhalbh an t-each bànn,
'Dhèanadh an ùir dhomh,
Màiri e baile,
'S e dheanadh a giùlan,
Goirtean nam Broighleag, etc.

The rats and mice which infested Highland homesteads were supposed to be particularly susceptible to bardic satire. That is to say, they could not endure it. The most audacious and persistent mouse quailed under a sarcastic rhyme, and hurriedly made tracks for pastures new. Most people will agree that the words which had so desirable an effect must have been *druigheach* indeed. The specimen which I have secured of that class of poetry contains nothing very scathing. In my note-book it is entitled :—Aoireadh, le Alastar Catanach, an Saor Ruadh, anns a 'Chreagan, 'nuair bha e fuadach nan luchan bho sabhal Bhiallaid. While banishing the unwelcome tribe to Drumuachdar, he condescends to wheedle them with promises of luxuries there in store :—

Ma ghabhas sibh mo chomhairl', luchan !
Truisidh sibh oirbh 's bidh sibh falbh.
Ma theid mise 'ga n-ur aoireadh,
Cha bhi aon agaibh gun chearb.
Cha-n'eil cat eadar Ruathainn,
'S bràigh Chluainidh nach bi sealg.
'S ann an sabhal Sandy Bànn,
Dh' ghearr sibh an snath as a' bhalg.

'N sin tur thubhairt an luch mhor 's i 'freagairt,
 Stad beag ort, a shaoidh òig.
 'S eagal leam gun gabh thu mlothlachd,
 Rinn mi di-chuimhn' ann am thròg.
 'S peacach dhuit mo chuir a balla,
 'S cur is cathadh ri mo shròin;
 'S mi gun fhios a'm ceana theid mi,
 'S ioma beum a gheibh mo sheòrs.
 Innsaidh mis' dhuit ceana theid sibh,
 'S ioma gleus tha air a' bhòrd.
 Ruigibh am fear mòr 'san Spideal,
 'S gheibh sibh hocair ann gu leòr.
 Ithibh 's òlaibh n-ur teannair,
 Ged a ghearradh sibh 'chuid bhròg,
 Dhiùlt e dhomh oidhch' mo dhinneir,
 Ged a phaidhinn gini òir.
 Gabhaidh sibh 'n rathad air n-ur athais,
 Bidh sibh 'n ath oidhch' an Gleann Truim,
 Tur ruigidh sibh clobhs' Dail-Choinnimh,
 'S ann an sid bhlo 's an cruinneachadh grinn.
 'H-uile te le dronnag-callaich,
 An déigh dealachdainn rium fhein,
 'Dol a' shealltuinn an fhir ghallda,
 'Chuir cuid Ailean gu dith.

It was, as is well known, an ancient belief among various races, that certain individuals had, by their voice, a strange influence over animals, to attract or to repel, as the case might be. The charm, or incantation, was uttered in a direful chant—quite different from such playful effusions as that of the Saor Ruadh.

The bereaved Highlander often gave vent to his woe in song descriptive of his plight. The poetical sighs of the forsaken lover are always with us copiously: Elegies upon departed chiefs, as we have already observed, bulk very largely. But strains of genuine domestic grief, such as the following verses supply, are comparatively rare. The rhythm, too, is uncommon, and the air much like the changing measures of a Piobaireachd:—

Nàile ! 's mise tha gun aighear,
 Fo mhi-ghean a dh' oidhch' 's a latha,
 Gun toil-inntinn 'tha fo'n adhar,
 Bho chuir iad 's an ùir mo dheadh bhean-tighe.

*E! ho! mo dhiùbhail fo'n fhòd,
 Fo ruighe nam bòrd,
 Ho! gur mis' tha gun aighear fo leòn,
 Mu do dhéidhinn.*

Nàile ! 's mise tha fo mhi-ghean,
Gar-n dean mi 'chàch 'innseadh,
Mi bhi 'cuimhneach' ort a mhinneag.
'S t-thu bhi do laidhe 'n Clachap na sgìreachd.

Nàile ! 's mise tha gun aiteas,
'S mi bhi 'thamh an so an Clachaig,
Bho nach d' tigeadh thusa dhachaidh,
A shealtuinn air do phaisdean laga.

Bha da ghruaidh dhearg ort mar an siris,
Beul is binne bho'n d'tigeadh iorram,
Cùl do chinn air dhreach an fhithich
Is gun d' thug mi dhuit rùn mo chridhe.

Phos mi thu le deoin gun aindeoin,
Gun toil àth'r, no màth'r, no caraid,
Rug thu dhomhs' do sheachdnar macan,
'S do nighean og 's cha d' fhaod thu 'h-altrum.

T. S.

UNPUBLISHED PROVERBS.

*Tha suil gabhuir an ceann nam fear
thaobh nam ban; tha suil seobhaig
an ceann nam ban thaobh nam fear.*

The men cast sheeps' (*lit.* goats') eyes at the women,
the women hawks' eyes at the men.

*A ghne bhios 'sa mhathair, is gnath leatha
bhith 'san nighinn.*

The nature possessed by the mother, it usually
appears in the daughter.

*Tha ceann air a h-uile rud, is a dha air
maraig, is toiseach air sin.*

There is an end (*lit.* head) on everything, and two on
a white pudding, and a beginning on that.

Aird na dalach is isle na h-airde.

The height (higher parts) of the plain and the hollows
of the height [are the fruitful parts].

*Cleas na grìbhre 'g itheadh na nathrach—sior itheadh is
sior thalach.*

Like the goat eating the adder—aye eating and
aye complaining.

THE HISTORY OF THE MACLEODS.

[BY ALEXANDER MACKENZIE.]

(Continued.)

MACLEOD was now (1783) promoted to the rank of Brigadier-General, and was appointed to the command of the army in place of General Mathews, who, in consequence of the representations of Macleod, Humberston, and Shaw, was suspended. Shortly before this it would appear that a resolution had been arrived at to draft the men of the second battalion of the 42nd to other corps, and to send home the officers and non-commissioned officers to Great Britain. Macleod was, however, at the same time specially requested by the Governor of the East India Company and the Special Committee to remain, as the authorities were of opinion that his services were absolutely necessary where he was. While quite willing to serve personally, he strongly urged that the men should not be drafted into any other regiment, and successfully pleaded his case in the following letter, addressed to the Indian Commander-in-Chief, only four days after the date of the letter to Mr. John Macpherson, a member of the Supreme Council of India, given in our last. On the subject of drafting his men, Macleod writes:—

To His Excellency Sir Eyre Coote, K. B.,
Commander-in-Chief of India.

Bombay, 18th March, 1783.

Sir,—General Carnac promises to do me the honour of delivering this letter to your Excellency, and I most sincerely hope he will find you in health and vigour once more at the head of your army.

The Select Committee have showed me instructions from the Governor-General and Supreme Council of Bengal to grant a passage home to the officers and non-commissioned officers of the 2nd Batt. of the 42nd Regt. in consequence of an order sent to your Excellency by Lord Hillsborough to draft the men. I also received a letter from Major Grattan, Adjt.-General, to hold them in readiness to be drafted accordingly. I have to observe to your Excellency that it is the first time ever that Regiment was drafted, and that we were raised upon the idea of being exempted from that misfortune. My own Company are all of my own name and clan, and if I return to Europe without them, I shall be effectually banished from my own home, after having seduced them into a situation from which they thought themselves spared when they enlisted into the service. They are now much reduced, and being on a

brisk actual service, will be still more so before they can be drafted; their numbers will then not exceed 30 or 40 men. I must entreat your Excellency to allow me to carry them home with me, that I may not forfeit my honour, credit, and influence in the Highlands, which have ever been exerted for His Majesty's Service. My connections and mode of entering into the army are not unknown to the King, and I am certain the favour I solicit for myself and clan from your Excellency will meet with his Royal approbation.

I did myself the honour of writing to you by Captain Hallem, soliciting your permission to be allowed to serve on this coast sometime longer. Since that time the Governor and Select Committee have written me a most obliging letter, of which the following is an extract :—"We have advice from the Honble. Governor and Council that you and the other officers of the 42nd Regt. are ordered to Europe, and the men to be incorporated in the other corps, but being of opinion that your services are absolutely requisite on this coast at this critical period, our duty to the Company, and to the trust reposed in us, impells us to make it our request to you that you will continue to serve."

In return, I told them that as my life and time were my country's, if they thought my services of such consequence, I was at their command in any way, with your Excellency's permission.

Major Grattan's letter having mentioned that some mode would be concerted with the Admiral, to carry the men round when drafted, I have yet heard of no such mode; the Regt. is now in the interior part of the country. When I am honoured with your particular commands as to the time and mode of drafting it, I shall immediately and implicitly follow them.

I have the honour to be, with the most perfect respect,

Sir,

Your Excellency's most obt. and most humble servt.,

(Signed)

NORMAN MACLEOD.

It would seem that this letter not only saved Macleod's clansmen from being drafted into another corps, but actually saved the battalion, which afterwards became the 73rd Regiment, from being broken up.

Tipoo, in May following, besieged a small force of British troops in Mangalore, with an overwhelming army of 60,000 horse and 30,000 disciplined Sepoys, and a body of 600 French infantry, under Colonel Cossigny, Lally's corps of Europeans and natives, a troop of dismounted French cavalry from the Mauritius, and irregular troops to the number of many thousands, supported by 90 pieces of artillery. The British garrison consisted of only 459 Europeans, of whom 231 were Highlanders, and 1,500 natives, fit for duty. This small force successfully defended Mangalore against the enormous army arrayed against it until the 30th of January, 1784, against repeated attacks, the continued

bombardment having at length made such breaches in the walls and reduced them in many parts to such a ruinous condition that the brave defenders could not venture to fire their cannon from their position. Tipoo's force suffered most severely, however, in many attacks, and in consequence, on the 20th of July, it was agreed on both sides to cease hostilities. But the enemy repeatedly broke faith, and actually fired a mine on the 23rd, at the very moment a flag of truce was flying, only three days after the agreement was entertained. Proposals for a regular armistice were again entered into on the 29th July, and concluded on the 2nd of August. General Macleod, with a small convoy of provisions and a small reinforcement of troops, anchored in the bay on the 17th of August, but "influenced by an honourable regard to the terms of the armistice," he ordered the ships back to Tillycherry, though the enemy were daily committing acts of treachery. The General reappeared on the 22nd of November in the bay with a considerable army. Instead of landing, he, through his secretary, entered upon a tedious negotiation with Tipoo, and having stipulated that one month's provisions should be admitted into the garrison, he set sail again on the 1st of December. Of the beef and pork sent in, in terms of this stipulation, "not one in twenty pieces could be eaten by the dogs." Macleod returned once more on the 31st of December, but again went away, still keeping "faith with the enemy, who showed no disposition to imitate his example." General Stewart informs us that the misery and privation of the troops thus tantalized, had risen to a height almost insupportable. They were reduced to nearly half their original number, and half the remainder were in hospital. Tormented and tantalized with so many expectations of relief, the sick, who had been temporarily invigorated by hope, became dispirited, and relapsed into a state of despondency that proved fatal to numbers of them. Many of the Sepoys became totally blind, and others were so weak that they dropped down where they stood shouldering their firelocks. Their provisions were almost consumed; their patience was entirely exhausted; they had no hope of relief, nor the least knowledge as to what part of the coast General Macleod was gone to. The troops were eating horse flesh, snakes, dogs, ravenous birds, kites, black game, rats, and

mice, and in the utmost distress for every necessary of life. In these circumstances, it was decided, by a council of war, to surrender the garrison on terms which were highly honourable to its gallant defenders, who held out for nearly nine months against such enormous odds. The terms offered were at once accepted by the enemy, the garrison marched out with arms, accoutrements, and the honours of war, and embarked for Tillycherry, where they landed on the 4th of February, 1784, after "a defence that has seldom been equalled and never surpassed." The brave band consisted of the second battalion of the 42nd, General Macleod's own regiment, a few men of the 100th, a detachment of European infantry and artillery, and the 1st and 8th battalions of Bombay Sepoys, afterwards made into a Grenadier corps, for their conspicuous gallantry during the siege, in the course of which Tipoo lost nearly half his enormous army. This was the last active service in which this regiment, as the second battalion of the 42nd, was engaged. At the conclusion of the war it was intimated to both battalions that instead of placing all the officers on half-pay, the juniors were to be reduced in the two corps, whereupon strong representations were made, and the services of the officers of each in distant regions pointed out. The matter was reconsidered by the authorities, and the second battalion being now complete in numbers by new recruits from the Highlands, the King ordered it to be formed into a separate corps, with green facings, to be designated the 73rd Highlanders, under the command of Sir George Osborne; and this was carried into effect on the 18th of April, 1786, at Dinapore, in Bengal, when it would appear General Macleod rejoined his old regiment.

In one of his despatches to the Sultan, General Macleod writes the following spirited passage. It explains itself:—"You, or your interpreter, have said, in your letter to me, that I have lied, or made a mensonge. Permit me to inform you, Prince, that this language is not good for you to give or me to receive; and if I were alone with you in the desert you would not dare to say these words to me. An Englishman scorns to lie; an English General who would dare to lie would be crushed to pieces by the just rage of our magnanimous King. You have said that I lied, or made a mensonge. This is an irreparable

affront to an English warrior. I tell you our customs; if you have courage enough to meet me, take a hundred of your bravest men on foot, meet me on the seashore, I will fight you, and a hundred men of mine will fight yours." What this bold challenge resulted in we have not been able to ascertain.

His son and successor, in a continuation of the General's Auto-biography, already quoted, and referring to his career in India, says:—"I know at this moment but little of the public history of my father at that period. From subsequent misfortunes that befel him my mother has never willingly talked of his career in India; all I know is, that he, a very young Lieutenant-Colonel in the King's service, commanded the army on the Malabar Coast, taking rank according to the regulation of those days of all Company's officers of the same rank, though of older standing; he served with great success, and made a good deal of money, about £100,000; but I believe, although not addicted to play, he suffered himself to comply with the custom of his associates, and lost all, or nearly all, of his earnings. In consequence of a new order, that Company's officers should hold rank according to the dates of their commissions, my father found himself under the necessity of resigning his command to those who had formerly obeyed him; and remaining in this situation not being consistent with his ideas of military propriety, he returned to England in the year 1789. My mother, with his children, followed him to Britain in 1790, and he was shortly afterwards [same year] unanimously returned at the General Election for the County of Inverness," which he continued to represent until the General Election of 1796. Having stated that in consequence of some misunderstanding with Henry Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, General Macleod joined the Opposition and became one of the most strenuous opponents of Mr Pitt's administration, his son continues--"His military prospects were now closed for ever, and from the early age of thirty-five to forty-seven, when he died, was to him a constant scene of disappointment, misfortune, and remorse. His income was far from being competent to his rank in life. I suspect it did not amount to more than two thousand a year; and while he was in America and India his Commissioners had sold large tracts of his estate (Harris and Loch

Snizort Side) for less than half their value. As he was the first of his family who parted with his inheritance, he was doubly grieved to find that he had impoverished his heirs, without materially benefitting himself." He increased the family debt from £50,000, at which amount he succeeded to it, to £70,000 at his death, notwithstanding that he sold the greater portion of the ancient Macleod inheritance. Harris and St. Kilda were sold in 1779 to Captain Alexander Macleod, one of the Macleods of Bernera, late of the "Mansfield" Indiaman, for the small sum, even then, of £15,000. St. Kilda has, however, since returned to the family. Alexander Hume, Captain Macleod's son, on the 26th of April, 1804, sold it and the adjoining islands to Colonel Donald Macleod of Achagoyle for the sum of £1350, whose son, the late Sir John Macpherson Macleod of Glendale, K.C.S.I., sold it in 1871 to the present Macleod of Macleod for £3000.

In 1796, Macleod contested the Burgh of Milbourn Port, at the General Election of that year, against one of the Paget family, when he was defeated at an expense of £15,000. To meet this outlay, he was obliged to dispose of the Waternish portion of his estates, which only realised the amount of his election expenses, though a few years after the same lands sold for £30,000.

Shortly after his defeat, he removed to Edinburgh, and in 1801 he took up his residence in a small country house, which he rented at Newhaven. His health, which had for some time been giving way, now began to get much worse, and in this year he accepted an invitation from a friend, Captain Murray, of the "Prince of Wales" Excise yacht, to accompany him on a voyage to Guernsey, expecting that the trip and change of air might produce an improvement in the state of his health. He had, however, scarcely arrived in the island when his family received intimation of his death.

General Macleod married, first, Mary, eldest daughter of Kenneth Mackenzie, third of Suddie, with issue—

1. Norman, who died young, and
2. Mary, who married Colonel Norman Ramsay, who fell at Waterloo. She died soon after her marriage, without issue.

Mrs. Macleod died in 1784 in France, whither she had gone with her two children during her husband's absence in India.

He married, secondly, in 1784, Sarah, daughter of N. Stackhouse, Second Member of Council at Bombay, then in her seventeenth year, with surviving issue—

3. John Norman, his heir and successor.
4. Sarah, who married her cousin, Robert Pringle of Stitchill, without issue. Both died soon after the marriage.
5. Amelia Anne, who married her cousin and brother-in-law, Sir John Pringle, Baronet, of Stitchill, with issue—James, his heir and successor.
6. Anne Eliza, who married, on the 3rd of July, 1821, Spencer Perceval, eldest son of the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, Prime Minister of Great Britain. She still survives at the ripe old age of 91 or 92 years.

General Macleod died at Guernsey in August, 1801, when he was succeeded by his eldest son,

XXI. JOHN NORMAN MACLEOD, born in 1788. He represented Sudbury in Parliament from 1828 to 1832. After the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 he contested the County of Inverness with Charles Grant, afterwards Lord Glenelg, but was defeated by a few votes.

He married, on the 16th of November, 1809, Anne, daughter of John Stephenson of Merstham, Kent, with issue—

1. Norman, his heir, now of Macleod.
2. Torquil James, who died young on the 28th of April, 1821.
3. Harold John Leod, who died unmarried in 1846.
4. Emily Sarah, now of Dunvegan Castle.
5. Anna Eliza, who, on the 2nd of June, 1840, married James Ogilvie Fairlie, of Williamfield, Ayrshire, with issue—(1) Henry James, born on the 9th of March, 1841; and (2) a daughter, who, in 1867, married Archibald Campbell, younger of Achandarrach, who died in September, 1885. Mrs. Fairlie died on the 9th of September, 1843.
6. Harriette Maria, who married John Campbell, of Glen-saddel, Argyleshire, with issue—(1) Charles, who, born in February, 1847, married, in 1873, Esther, daughter of Colonel Fairlie, by his second wife; (2) Walter Frederick, born in 1850, and died in 1882; (3) John

- Norman, born in 1852; (4) Eleanor Ann; and (5) Harriette Roma, who died unmarried, in 1870. Mrs. Campbell died on the 14th of January, 1877.
7. Eleanor Anne, who died unmarried on the 3rd of December, 1830, aged 13 years.
 8. Mary Lowther, who, in 1846, married Robert Fergusson, M.D., F.R.S. Physician to the Queen, with issue—(1) Robert Ronald; (2) Harold Stuart; (3) Robert Bruce; (4) Mary Roma, who married Major Farrant of the 81st Regiment; and (5) Marian Cecil.
 9. Elizabeth Roma, who died unmarried on the 9th of March 1845.

John Norman Macleod died on 25th March, 1835, when he was succeeded by his eldest son,

XXII. NORMAN MACLEOD, now of Macleod, who, born on the 18th of July, 1812, married on the 15th of July, 1837, the Hon. Louisa Barbara St. John, only daughter of St. Andrew, 13th Lord St. John of Bletshoe, with issue—

1. Norman Magnus, Captain, 74th Highlanders, who, born on the 27th of July, 1839, married on the 27th of April, 1881, Emily Caroline, second daughter of Sir Charles Isham, Baronet of Lamport Hall, Northampton, with issue—(1) Emily Caroline; and (2) Margaret.
2. Torquil Olave, born on the 10th of August, 1841, and died young on the 3rd September, 1857.
3. Reginald, born on the 1st February, 1847, and married, on the 17th of April, 1877, Lady Agnes Mary Cecilia, eldest daughter of the late Right Hon. Earl of Iddesleigh, with issue—(1) Flora Louisa Cecilia; and (2) Olive Susan Miranda.
4. Roderick Charles, a clergyman of the Church of England, vicar of Borley, in Kent. He was born on the 18th of April, 1852, and married, in 1885, Catharine, daughter of W. Jelf.
5. Louisa Cecilia, who, on the 18th of December, 1860, married John Moyer Heathcote of Conington Castle, County of Huntington, with issue—(1) John Norman, born on the 21st of June, 1863; (2) Arthur Ridley,

born on the 14th of February, 1877; (3) Emily Louisa, who died unmarried, in her nineteenth year, on the 25th of May, 1880; (4) Evelyn May.

Macleod married secondly on the 14th of July, 1881, the Baroness Hanna, eldest daughter of Baron Ettingshausen of Graz, Austria, without issue.

[Before parting with the Macleods of Dunvegan, an article on the famous Fairy Flag and Rory Mor's horn ought perhaps to be given. After that the author will take up the history of the Skye branch families of Tallisker, Bernera, Gesto, Drynoch, and others. When these are disposed of, the Macleods of Lewis, Assynt, Cadboll, and other branches will be dealt with at length; but whether the history of these families will appear in the *Celtic Magazine* or in the *Scottish Highlander* has not yet been finally settled.—A. M.]

JOHN SINCLAIR, THIRD EARL OF CAITHNESS, OF THE SINCLAIR LINE.

[By GEORGE M. SUTHERLAND, F.S.A. Scot., Wick.]

ON the death of William, at Flodden, he was succeeded by his son, John, in the Earldom of Caithness. Earl John held the Earldom for sixteen years. He was married to Elizabeth, a daughter of Sir William Sutherland of Duffus. Mr. J. T. Calder, in his *History of Caithness*, gives her name as Mary, but this is evidently a mistake, as her name appears Elizabeth in all deeds written at the time. It is right to observe, however, that some consider that Earl John was twice married, first to Mary Sutherland—not Elizabeth—a daughter of the Laird of Duffus, and afterwards to the fifth sister of Adam, Earl of Sutherland. Mr. Thomas Sinclair, in his interesting Notes to the second edition of Calder's *History of Caithness*, writes: "Further light is thrown on things if it is true that Earl John of Caithness was married to Adam's sister after the death or divorce of his first wife, Mary Sutherland, daughter of Duffus. The authorities for this are William Gordon

in his *History of the Gordons to 1690*, published in 1726, and C. A. Gordon in his *History of the House of Gerston*, published at Aberdeen in 1754." There is no evidence of the marriage of Earl John with Mary Sutherland in the charter chest of the Earl of Caithness. If the marriage had taken place, such an important fact would have been mentioned in the proof taken before the House of Lords, in 1791, when the Earldom was contested by competing claimants. But, at anyrate, it may not be of much moment whether the Earl was married once or twice, other than in its relation to his connection with the House of Sutherland.

There is very little doubt that when Adam Gordon, Earl of Sutherland, was in course of dispossessing Alexander Sutherland from all title to the Earldom of Sutherland, on the alleged ground of illegitimacy, that he entered into a compact with the Earl of Caithness. Adam had many enemies, and it was necessary that he should secure the powerful influence of the Earl of Caithness. Sir Robert Gordon, in his *History of the House and Clan of Sutherland*, describes the true position of the parties as follows:—"Adam, Earl of Sutherland, foreseeing great troubles likely to fall forth in his country, he entered in familiarity and friendship with John Sinclair, Earl of Caithness, this year, 1516, at which time Earl Adam gave unto the Earl of Caithness, who was the near cousin of his wife, Lady Elizabeth, the ten davochs of land that lie upon the east side of the water of Ully (Helmsdale) for assisting him against his enemies as doth appear by some of the writs yet extant." It is clear that the House of Sutherland desired to have the good offices of Earl John, for in 1513, the year in which he succeeded to the title, Elizabeth, Countess of Sutherland granted to the Earl of Caithness a charter of the lands of Helmsdale, etc., called Strathulzie. Earl John did not get possession until the year after, when the death of her brother took place. It would appear that Earl John must have given considerable aid to Earl Adam in defeating the claims of Alexander Sutherland, for in 1516 a charter of Helmsdale, etc., was granted by Elizabeth, Countess of Sutherland, and Adam Gordon, Earl of Sutherland, to John, Earl of Caithness, "for his expenses in recovering the County of Sutherland and Castle of Dunrobin from the Countess's brother, Alexander Sutherland." This would imply that Earl

John had given material assistance to the Earl of Sutherland.

King James the IV. of Scotland granted a charter to John, Earl of Caithness, and Elizabeth Sutherland, his spouse, and William, their son, of certain lands dated 14th July, 1527, and in this charter there is the following reference to Helmsdale:—"Ac etiam totas et integras predictas terras de Helmsdail dicto Willmo Sinclair et heredibus suis de nobis, etc. Et dictas terras Cathanie in libero comitatu in perpetu, etc."

John Mackay, the Chief of the Clan Mackay, assisted his brother-in-law, Alexander Sutherland, to obtain possession of the titles and land of Sutherland. Earl John induced Niel Navarach Mackay to claim the lands of John Mackay on the plea that the latter was illegitimate, and therefore not entitled to succeed. Niel Navarach invaded Strathnaver with some adherents and a company of Caithness-men, but Donald Mackay, the brother of John, fell upon them at Lochnaver and defeated them. The Earl of Caithness apparently thought that he had not much interest in the feuds between the Sutherlands and the Mackays, and he therefore left the Earl of Sutherland to take care of himself. He no doubt saw that if the Mackays were defeated by himself and the Earl of Sutherland, that the position of his own house might be endangered afterwards should a struggle occur between the Sutherlands and Sinclairs. The existence of the Clan Mackay was necessary at the time to preserve the balance of power in the two Northern Counties.

Sir Robert Gordon is indignant that the Earl of Caithness should have withdrawn from the assistance of the Earl of Sutherland, although he had received lands from the latter, for defending him against his enemies. Indeed, he alleges that, notwithstanding the consideration given, the Earl of Caithness had actually allied himself with the enemies of the Earl of Sutherland. Sir Robert writes that the Earl of Caithness "joyned afterward with Earle Adam his foes, and yet kept still the lands, until Alexander, Earle of Sutherland, did purchase them back from Earle John, his successor, by excambion, for certane Church lands within Catteynes, the yeir of God, 1591. These ten davaghs of land within Strathully were given by Earle Adam to John, Earle of Catteynes, upon a reversion to this effect, that wheresoever the

Earle of Sutherland should give unto Earle John or his successors twentie pound land lying within Catteynes, that then he or they should renounce to the Earle of Sutherland these lands lying within Strathully." Sir Robert moralises over the conduct of the Earl of Caithness in the following manner:—"Thus we sie that usually mercenarie friends doe change alwayes with the course of fortune. They follow and favore upon us in floorishing prosperitie; but in pinching adversitie, and when the winter of our happiness does once approach, behold they suddentlie vanish and grow strangers to us in our greatest need and necessitie."

In May, 1529, Earl John invaded Orkney with five hundred men. The real cause of the invasion is not exactly known. Several causes have been assigned for it. It has been stated that he went to assist Lord Sinclair of Ravenscraig to recover some land of which he or his predecessors had been deprived. Again, that he went to take possession of lands belonging to the Sinclairs which they had got from the King of Denmark. It is also stated that he might have gone to recover the governorship of Kirkwall Castle, which Sir James Sinclair refused to give up. Mr. Worsaae, in writing of the matter, says:—"The islanders took up arms under the command of their Governor, Sir James Sinclair, to oppose the appointment of a Crown vassal over the islands." But whatever led to the expedition, the result was very unfortunate to the Caithness men. A desperate battle was fought at Summerdale, a place north-east about four miles from Stromness. The Orkney men totally routed their opponents. The Earl of Caithness was slain, and Lord Sinclair of Ravenscraig was taken prisoner. Very few of the Caithness men escaped, and many of them were killed in cold blood. The Earl was buried in Orkney; but some say that the few of his clan who had escaped took the Earl's head back with them, while others allege that it was sent over in derision by the Orkney men to Caithness. Robert Mackay, in his *History of the House and Clan of Mackay*, remarks—"This gave rise to an imprecation, which is to this day used in the North Highlands, 'Shuil mhorer Gaol do' Arcu dhuit, gun hian dachi ach en cann,' i.e., 'I wish you Lord Caithness's journey to Orkney, only the head to return.'"

Shortly after the battle of Summerdale, Sir James Sinclair, the Governor of Kirkwall Castle, committed suicide by throwing himself over a rock into the sea at Linkness. Another version is that he killed himself at Stirling. It is believed that he had no instructions from the Government to fight the battle of Summerdale, and was on that account terrified that he might be prosecuted for the death of the Earl of Caithness. It may be taken for granted that the Earl's invasion had something to do with the interests of Sir James Sinclair; and the disaster in Orkney, coupled with the great loss at Flodden, must have drained the county of Caithness of its best men.

Tradition asserts that the Earl was warned by a witch on landing in Orkney that the side on which blood would first be drawn would be defeated. The Earl and his men, to ensure victory, slew the first person they met. This happened to be a herd boy, a native of Caithness. When it was ascertained that it was Caithness blood that had first been shed, the Earl and his party became dispirited, as they were satisfied victory would go against them. The Earl was accompanied to Orkney by William Sutherland, of Berriedale, a man of great stature and immense strength. Sutherland had a presentiment that he would never return, and, before departing, he went to the church-yard at Berriedale, where he stretched himself on the ground, placing one stone at his head and another at his feet, the difference betwixt the two which was eight feet three inches, was his own height. He was killed in the battle.

On an occasion before Earl John went to Orkney, he had some difference with Robert Gunn, the tacksman of Braemore. He sent his kinsman, John Sinclair, of Stirkoke, to recover the rent which was owing by Gunn, but the latter wounded Sinclair, and made the party beat a hasty retreat without any rent.

Earl John had two sons, named (1) William, who died in 1527, without issue, and (2) George, who succeeded to the Earldom. The Earl had also a natural son, David, who was Bailie to the Bishop of Caithness.

Little is known of the personal character of the Earl. He appears, judging from the scanty information which we have of him, to have been wary and cautious up to the time when he proceeded on his ill-advised expedition to Orkney.

SOME PECULIAR USES OF THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUN IN GAELIC.

[By P. C. MACFARLANE.]

(1) WINDISCH says (Irish Grammar, p. 110) that "in Irish the possessive pronoun stands in the place where in other languages a substantival personal pronoun is used." Probably this peculiarity of Gaelic is only apparent, for there seems sufficient reason to believe that the possessive pronoun has supplanted the original personal pronoun; *e.g.*, "Tha e an déigh mo bhualadh" (he is after striking me) seems to be for "Tha e an déigh *mi a* bhualadh." "Tha e an déigh do bhualadh" for "Tha e an déigh *tu a* bhualadh." A strong proof in support of this theory is the fact that the infinitive cannot be put in the genitive case after a possessive pronoun. We cannot say "Tha e an déigh mo bhualaidh." Dr. Stewart says, in his Grammar (ed. 1876, pp. 156-157), that "the infinitive is not put in the genitive when preceded by a possessive pronoun, because it is in the same limited state as if it governed a noun in the genitive case." He evidently means that the infinitive following is sufficiently limited by the possessive pronoun, and that it is therefore redundant to use the genitive. Now, this would be a good enough reason, if it were found that no other nouns besides infinitives could be put in the genitive case after a possessive pronoun. But not only can other nouns be put in the genitive after a possessive pronoun, (*e.g.*, "tha e air muin m'eich," "tha e aig cùl do thighe"), but the infinitive when *not* preceded by a possessive pronoun is, if declinable, declined like any other noun; *e.g.*, "fear a' bhualaidh," "am fear-glanaidh."

Again, whenever the emphatic form of the pronoun is required, the personal pronoun can be restored; *e.g.*, "Tha e an déigh *mise a* bhualadh." No doubt it is equally common to hear "Tha e an déigh mo bhualadh-*sa*," but it can easily be understood how the emphatic particle would be removed to the end after the substituted possessive pronoun and the infinitive had sufficiently coalesced to be regarded as a grammatical formula.

It may be objected that the possessive pronoun, in the feminine singular, and in the three persons of the plural, cannot be resolved into the personal pronoun, with the preposition

before the infinitive, but the confusion having probably arisen first in the persons of the singular, as being more frequently used, the others would inevitably follow by analogy.

(2) This trick of the possessive pronoun may afford a more satisfactory explanation of such constructions as "Tha e 'na athair" (he is a father), etc., than has hitherto been given. "Athair," in this construction is the infinitive of a denominative verb (cf. Windisch's *Ir. Gram.* p. 111.); but it is not necessary that the verb should exist, except in the infinitive, nor even in the infinitive, except with this preposition *an* (in). But the infinitive is an abstract noun; therefore the editor of *The Scottish Celtic Review* is right when he says (p. 300) that the expression means "he is in the *state* or *quality*, denoted by the term father." The effect of this kind of infinitive is sometimes noticeable in the idiom of Gaelic people when speaking English, *e.g.*, "Can ye *music* Johnnie?" was a question asked by an old woman in this place.

(3) The preposition *an* (in) gives the infinitive a passive meaning; *e.g.*, "Tha a' bhraich am bogadh" (the malt is steeped, or in a state of steeping). "Tha an uinneag an togail" (the window is up). *Ag, aig* (at), on the other hand, with the infinitive has an active meaning; *e.g.*, "Tha e 'g itheadh an arain" (he is eating the bread). "Tha e seinn" (he is singing.) This seems contradicted by the construction "Tha an t-aran 'ga itheadh" (the bread is being eaten), but if a reflexive pronoun, or more probably the personal pronoun used reflexively, ought here to be substituted for the possessive pronoun, then it is not a case of *ag* with the infinitive, but of *ag* governing a phrase which contains the infinitive, *e.g.*, "Tha an t-aran ag e do itheadh."

(4) If "athair" be regarded as an infinitive in the construction "Tha e 'na athair," then by analogy of the construction "Tha a' bhraich am bogadh," the form "tha e an athair" would be expected, and in Welsh this is just what is found. But as a denominative infinitive is the same in form with the noun from which it is derived, and as it is necessary in a construction like this that they be distinguished, the preposition *do*, the usual sign of the infinitive, is prefixed to "athair." Then the construction will become "Tha e *an do* athair," which, by the rule of eclipsis, must become "Tha e 'na athair."

Of course identity with the possessive pronoun can be shown only in the second person singular of both genders, and in the third person singular masculine, but that appears sufficient when viewed in the light of the construction, "Tha e an déigh mo bhualadh," examined above.

[If it be made out that this is really not the possessive pronoun, the Editor of *The Scottish Celtic Review* must be in error, when he says in his able and interesting essay on *The particle ann* (p. 299) that this construction "is precisely the same formula" as "Tha e 'na thaigh" (he is in his house); "Tha e 'na bhàta" (he is in his boat), etc.]

(5) *Do* as the sign of the infinitive is prefixed not only to mere denominatives, but also to infinitives which are ordinarily used as nouns, and have acquired a concrete meaning. Thus, an infinitive derived from "tiodhlac" (a funeral) requires *do*, as in the following colloquy:—"Ciod e tiodhlac"? "Còmhlan dhaoine dol do'n chlachan." "Agus ma theid còmhlan dhaoine do'n chlachan Di-dòmhnach, am bi e 'na thiodhlac"? Again, when it is used simply as the infinitive of the verb to "bury" *do* is not required, e.g., "Tha e an tiodhlac an Cill-Phàdrug," (he is buried in Kilpatrick). In both cases "tiodhlac" is an infinitive, but in the former it is a term of greater intension, because the meaning is limited to the specialised sense in which the word is used as a noun, viz., "a funeral."

As might be expected, however, the distinction is too nice to be always strictly observed in practice, and accordingly both kinds of infinitives are sometimes found, with the same signification, e.g., "An ann 'ga dhiùltadh 's do làmh an sìneadh g'a ghabhail"? But it would also be right to say "'na sìneadh g'a ghabhail." When an adjective is added, as for example, "Tha e 'na athair math," then it is not "athair," which is regarded as the infinitive, but the concept "athair math."

(6) The infinitives of frequentative verbs, with the preposition *an* (in) require the article—e.g., "Ruith e gus an robh e 'san àineagach" (he ran till he was panting). "Throid e ris na buantachan gus an robh iad 'san rànaich" (he scolded the children till they were crying). "Cha toir thu biadh do'n chrodh uair idir gus am bi iad 'sa' gheumnaich," etc.

SUBSTANTIAL GHOSTS.

THE ghosts of modern Gaelic belief are the ordinary unsubstantial airy beings which, since the Middle-Ages, have taken the place of the older substantial Gaelic ghosts. The modern ghost, among the Highlanders, does not differ therefore from the ghosts among other peoples. But there are many indications in our popular tales that the old Gaelic ghost was quite as substantial a personage as the living men he happened to mingle with. In our January number we showed that the ghost of old Irish literature was as golden and glorious in the ghostly form as the individual was when alive. We may assert the same of the ghost of old Gaelic Scotland, and adduce as proof the following incidents and stories.

Firstly, in Campbell's tale of the "Barra Widow's Son," the hero in his travels arrived in Turkey, and while walking about one day what did he see but two men out of their tunics (*as an leintean*, "out of their shirts" it means now) flailing a man's corpse! "What are you doing to the corpse?" says John, the widow's son. "It was a Christian; we had eight marks against him, and since he did not pay us when alive, we will take it out of his corpse with the flails." "Well, then, leave him with me and I will pay you the eight marks." He took the body and "he put mould and earth on him." After various adventures, the hero was sailing with his lady-love, the King of Spain's daughter, to her home in Spain, when, by the treachery of a General on board, who also loved the lady, John was left on a desert island. "John was in the island, hair and beard grown over him; his shoes were worn to pulp, without a thread of clothes on that was not gone to rags; without a bit of flesh on him, his bones but sticking together. On a night of the nights, what should he hear but the rowing of a boat coming to the island. 'Art thou there, Iain Albanich,' said one in the boat." John was afraid to answer, but after a little he came to the shore and found a man there in a boat. The man asked him what he would give him to take him off the island. Would he give him half his kingdom, and half his wife and children? John answered that he had no kingdom, or wife or children, but if he had he

would give them. On these conditions they sailed to Spain. There he recovered his lost lady-love, and was married. Three sons were born to him, and he became King of Spain. On a night he heard a knocking at the door. "Art thou for keeping thy promise?" said he who came. John said "Yes." The man then gave his kingdom and wife back to himself and told John that he was the man for whose body he had paid the eight marks in Turkey.

Our other examples are from tales hitherto unpublished. The tale of the adventures of "Iain Mòr" we hope soon to publish under the able editing of the Rev. Mr. Sinton, who has got together a version of it. One of the incidents is this: Iain lands on a Western desolate shore, and the first object that meets his gaze is the skeleton of a man bleaching unburied in the sun. Iain takes off his tunic (*leine* again, now shirt, which shows these tales to be very old), and covers the skeleton with it. For this act of piety he is amply rewarded, for at the great crisis of his life a man intervenes to help him—a *man*, whom he afterwards finds to be the man whose skeleton he had covered with his *leine*. As in the story of the "Barra Widow's Son," there is not a hint that the "man" appeared different from living men.

The other story is this: There was a widow who had an only son, and she did not wish him to marry until it was her pleasure that he should do so. The young man promised that he would not marry until she wanted him to marry. One snowy day she killed a bird and let its blood fall on the snow. Then she took a crystal boot, and asked her son to look for a lady-love whose cheeks were red as the blood on the snow, whose skin was as white as the snow, and whose foot would fit the crystal boot. He started on his quest, and the first night came to a church-yard, where he saw two men breaking some bones. On looking he saw the bones were the skeleton of a man. He asked them why they were doing this, and they replied that they had a debt against him, which they could not get from him now. They were to be revenged on his bones, they said, for it. He asked the amount of the debt, and on being told what it was, offered them the money, so as to let the man's bones rest. They answered, however, that they were

dead as well as the man, but their brothers and sisters dwelt on the hillside up there. Accordingly, they requested him to go and pay the money to them, which he did. Thereafter, when going through a lonely wood, he met a man who told him it was for him he paid the debt. The young man told him of his quest. "Ah," said the ghost-man, "you will be successful enough." He directed the young man to a large house where he would get a cloak of darkness, which, when put on, would render him invisible, and also magic slippers, with which he could walk without being heard. The rest of his adventures our informant could not tell, nor would they likely bear in any case on the subject in hand.

A QUEER STORY.

[FROM A MULL MAN.]

I REMEMBER, one winter night, as I was along with some other young men, we proposed to go into a little cottage not far away to hear some stories from the old man who dwelt there. At our earnest request he related to us the following story:—"There once stood a kiln on the south-west coast of Mull, where men and even boys were accustomed to meet, for the purpose of playing cards, telling stories, singing songs, and other amusements. It was, in fact, a rough kind of "céilidh" house. It happened one night that they were telling stories, and the law, as they called it themselves, that they had, was that every one who entered the kiln should have to tell a story. They were sitting in a row round the fire, with the owner of the kiln at their head. It was he that had to tell the first story, and the nearest to him the next, and so on till they would all tell one story each. Some fellow unaccustomed to their manners came in among the company on that night. When his time came for telling a story he hadn't any to tell, and the other fellows were on the point of offering him violence, when the old man relieved him from his troubles by telling him to go out and put some straw in a hole that was in the wall to keep out the wind.

As he was standing out at the window, he happened to look towards the shore, and to his great dismay saw a ship on the point of being cast on the rocks by the storm. He hastened down to the shore as quickly as possible, and on finding a punt near at hand, he jumped into it and rowed out towards the ship. But before he got half-way out, the wind shifted and drove him away from the land, in spite of all the efforts he made to regain it. He was driven away past Colonsay, Islay, and Jura, and all the way until he landed on the north coast of Ireland. The punt in which he was, was cast ashore in a little creek, where a little cottage stood about twenty yards above the shore. This cottage was inhabited by an old woman and a young girl, and along with it they had a small croft. The girl's father had died about a month before the young Mull man came, so that they hadn't anyone to keep the croft in order. Therefore the young girl and the castaway fellow made an agreement and were married within the short time of a week after his landing in Ireland. He lived very happily with his wife and mother-in-law for four years, and was the father of four children, before he left them. But as ill-fortune had driven him thither, he was driven back again by the same means. For, as he was one night out fishing, a storm came on so suddenly, that he was driven away from land, back the same way as he had come, until he landed in the same place in Mull, where he had started from. He went ashore and walked up to the kiln, where he was greatly astonished at beholding the same individuals he had left there when he went away sitting in the same place, and everything exactly in the same condition as he had left them. The old man asked him if he had any story to tell now. He told him that he had, and he related his adventures since he left them. The young fellows began to laugh at him, but their laughing was soon brought to an end, when the old man told them that the young fellow had only seen a vision which was caused by his means, for he was the possessor of what they called 'Sgoil dhubh' (black art.) But the deep impression wrought on the young fellow's mind could never be effaced. So he went home that night, mourning for the wife and children that he had left in Ireland."

REVIEWS.

POPULAR TALES AND FICTIONS: THEIR MIGRATIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS. By W. A. CLOUSTON. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons, 1887.

MR. CLOUSTON'S work is one of the most valuable that has yet appeared on the subject of the migration of popular tales and the consequent changes they undergo. He belongs to the advanced school of folk-lorists who believe in tracing each story to its oldest literary source, and from this standpoint deciding on its origin and meaning. The "solar" theory he discards with more than contempt, and it is undoubtedly true that, whatever truth there may be in that theory as regards the higher mythology, it makes utter shipwreck in accounting for the origin of fairy and folk tales. The "Sun-frog" has been the butt of uproarious fun to anthropologists, and to none more so than Mr. Lang, and no wonder. The "Solar" theory of the diffusion of folk-tales, whereby the tales are referred to the period of Argan unity, and thereafter each race worked on the common stock of myth and tale in its own peculiar way, is founded on a much sounder basis. Indeed, the resemblance of the higher mythology of Teuton, Celt, Roman, Greek, and Indian points to a common source for these mythologies, and it may be held properly enough that many folk-tales are descended from the times of the Indo-European unity. Indeed, Mr. Clouston grants as much as this. "That tales and legends of a more or less supernatural cast, dealing with magical arts (and the phenomena of physical nature, too, perhaps), in other words, our nursery fairy tales, which are found in almost identical forms, allowing for occasional local modifications and colouring, among peoples differing so much in their customs and modes of thought as the Norwegians and the Italians, are reflections or survivals of primitive Aryan traditions, which also continue current in Asiatic countries, may, I think, be to some extent granted." The case is very different, however, as he adds, "when we consider the question of the origin and diffusion of tales which have in them nothing of the supernatural

—tales, namely, of common life." He has, therefore, roughly divided folk tales into two classes, those dealing with magic and the supernatural, and those dealing with the incidents of common life.

It is with these last that Mr. Clouston's two volumes deal for the most part. Of these, stories of the fickleness of women—satirical tales of widow's tears—are the best examples. The oldest story of any now existing is an Egyptian one three thousand years old, and it is the prototype of all our "Joseph and Potiphar's wife" tales. The inconsolable widow who cannot be torn from her husband's grave, who lights a fire at it, intending to pass the night there, and who is joined by a knight who is watching the three corpses of crucified robbers, and in whose company she finds so much consolation that she exhumes her husband and places his body on the cross in place of the one that was stolen during the dalliance of the knight with herself,—this story comes from the East, doubtless, where female constancy is more disbelieved in than in the West. Such tales have circumstantial incidents in them which must point to an individual authorship in some fixed locality. The incidents could not originate spontaneously in Asia and in Europe; the one must borrow tales of this class—detailed incidents of inconstancy, cunning, stupidity, and avarice—from the other. Mr. Clouston has set himself to trace such tales to their original habitat, and we have to say that he has done his work admirably. He shows how Eastern stories and story books were brought into Europe, especially at the time of the Crusades. Works like the "*Book of Sindibád*" are even previous to the Crusades. This work appears on European ground among other forms as the tale of the "*Seven Sages*," who saved the king's son from the Potiphar's-wife wiles of his stepmother by relating stories to his father, the king, mostly about female deceit, until the young man was able to speak for himself, which he was supernaturally forbidden to do for seven days. Middle-Age preachers like Jacques de Vitry (died 1240 A.D.) made use of many such Eastern stories in their discourses. Portions of the Gaelic story of the "*Shifty Lad*"—particularly the parts regarding the robbery of the king's treasury—are as old as Herodotus, who tells them of the Egyptian king, Rhampsinitus, and likely enough the story may be

borrowed from the East. That it started in Egypt and in the Highlands, separately and spontaneously, is absurd. That stories like these go back to a period of Indo-European unity is, though possible, quite improbable, while many of the tales are found among Semites, Chinese, Kalmucks, etc., quite outside the Aryan family.

When Mr. Clouston goes further and refers magic transformation, disappearances of enchanted persons under taboos, life and chastity tokens, Bluebeard chambers, and other sins of curiosity, to an Eastern origin, as he often does, we refuse to follow him. To suggest, for instance, that the Cupid and Psyche story, which, in its oldest literary form, is European, appearing in Apuleius in the 2nd century, is of Eastern origin, is not satisfactory—not scientific, in fact. There is a craze among certain folklorists to make India the cradle of all such stories. Mr. Ralston here and MM. Paris and Cosquin in France, are the leading exponents of this view; while Mr. Lang and M. Gaidoz maintain the polygenism of such tales—that they spring from beliefs and customs through which the race has passed, that they are survivals, in short, as the “craggan” pottery of Lewis is a survival from the stone-age. This is the “anthropological” theory. Those who maintain their Indian origin seem to be led astray by the Indian beliefs in transmigrations of the soul and animal transformations. But such beliefs were rife here in the West in Caesar’s time, and it is nothing to be wondered at that they should survive in our folk-tales, as they certainly do in our folk-lore and superstitions. Mr. Clouston, however, stands between the Indian and the anthropological school, and, indeed, his book is wonderfully free from the warping of any theory. Its value lies in the bringing together and comparison of the different versions, and its theories do not interfere at all with this excellent work. The theory is, indeed, unobtrusive. The meaning and origin of the supernatural, magical, and monster incidents and characters, he does not discuss. He allows himself to believe that ogres and monsters may have originated in the contests between the Aryan tribes and the savage aborigines, or, going still further back, between the monstrous creatures of the early earth and men, which last is rather dangerous ground, and the former theory is also somewhat unsatisfactory. The book is one which no folk-lorist can do with-

out. The publishers have done their part as excellently as the author himself has done his.

M. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE has sent us a paper which he gave to the Academie Des Inscriptions on the "Fundus and the Villa in Gaul." *Fundus* and *villa* are two correlative terms. The *fundus* or farm is the portion of land under agricultural cultivation belonging to a definite proprietor, and the *villa* is the group of houses where the proprietor of the *fundus* and his farm-servants dwell. The *fundus* and *villa* are Roman in name and idea. Their introduction into Gaul dates from the Roman Conquest. "In Gaul before the conquest," says M. D'Arbois, "there existed neither *fundi* nor *villae*. Gaul had *oppida* (towns) which Caesar sometimes calls *urbes* (cities). Some *vici* are also found, but what corresponds to the Roman villa is called by Caesar *aedificium*, of which numerous examples could be gathered in the 'Bello Gallico.' There were then no *fundi* in Gaul at the date this work goes back to, and in the Gaulish *pagi* (cantons) the proprietorship of the soil was collective." Land could not have received personal names at that time, for private property in the soil did not then exist. Polybius (204-122, B.C.) says that the Gauls who established themselves by conquest in Northern Italy in the fourth century before our era knew nothing of landed property; with them the fortunes of individuals consisted solely in movables, mainly gold and herds. The disposition of property as between man and wife, which Caesar records, points the same way. In short, land not built upon was everywhere throughout Gaul the property of the people or rather of the tribe, the *ager publicus* of the Romans.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CUP SONG.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CELTIC MAGAZINE."

ALL who take an interest in the history, language, and literature of the Gael must rejoice that the *Celtic Magazine* is getting along so well. It is thoroughly adapted to the wants of all. Its "Notes and News," and especially its "Reviews," are of very great value. I have read with deep interest the articles on "The Present State of Celtic Studies," "The Present State of Celtic Ethnology," and "Loan-Words in Gaelic." Of course I always read the articles on clan history with pleasure. Mr. Mackenzie has placed, not only the Mackenzies, the Macdonalds, the Camerons, and the Macleods, but indeed all Highlanders, under deep obligations to him by his valuable historical articles.

T. S. is doing a good work in publishing his "Snatches of Gaelic Songs collected in Badenoch." For my own part I feel very grateful to him. He does not see much merit in the Gille Maol Dubh's rhyme, and no wonder. I suspect either that the Gille Maol Dubh was a plagiarist, or else that his words got sadly out of joint before they came down to T. S. I have a very different version of the words, and as I do not know who T. S. is, I take the liberty of sending it to the magazine.

Dr. Hector Maclean lived at the farm of Erray, near Tobermory in 1773, the year in which Johnson and Boswell visited the Hebrides. He was a son of Lachlan Maclean of Grulin. His mother, Janet Macleod, was a daughter of John Macleod of Contulich, tutor of Macleod, and Isabel, daughter of Sir Kenneth Mackenzie of Scatwell. He was married to Catherine, daughter of Donald Maclean of Coll. He had a daughter named Mary. Of this Mary Dr. Johnson speaks in the following terms:—"She is the most accomplished lady that I have found in the Highlands. She knows French, music, and drawing; sews neatly, makes shell-work, and can milk cows; in short, she can do everything. She talks sensibly, and is the

first person whom I have found that can translate Gaelic poetry literally."—Carruthers' Edition of Boswell's Journal, page 252. Dr. Maclean died in 1785. His accomplished daughter married a Duncan Mackenzie of Aros, a man who was inferior to herself in every respect. She died in 1826, and was buried at Kilmore, about seven miles from Tobermory. She had no children.

Dr. Maclean made quite a large collection of Gaelic poetry. Mary his daughter added a few pieces to it. This collection was never printed. It is now in my possession. The following version of the Cup Song I copy from it :—

Subject given to the Poet.

'S namhaid an lach is an thaoileann,
Da chois chapail, chaoilin, chorr.

The Poet's Reply.

An cup sin tha 'n laimh rìgh Alba,
Air an deach airgid is or,
Olaidh mi deoch as ma dh'fhaodas ;—
Da chois chapail, chaoilin, chorr.

The Poet gained the Cup and added—

D' fhuaras deoch a laimh rìgh Alba
A cup airgid agus oir,
An aite nach d' shaoil mi fhaotuinn ;—
'S da chois chapail, chaoilin, chorr.

There is a reference to this poem in MacNicol's Remarks on Dr. Johnson's Journey to the Hebrides. It will be found at page 129 of Livingstone's Edition. Mr. MacNicol says that the subject of the poem was proposed by "James the Sixth to some poets as a trial of skill in their profession." He regards it as "altogether unintelligible."

Dr. Johnson says—"I believe there cannot be recovered in the whole Gaelic language five hundred lines of which there is any evidence to prove them one hundred years old." Of course, the great lexicographer had not seen the Dean of Lismore's book, and we may think that he had some excuse for his assertion. There can be no doubt, however, that he saw Dr. Maclean's MS. The poems in it were certainly written down before the year 1773. Then Bos-

well makes the following statements :—"Miss Maclean produced some Gaelic poems by John Maclean, who was a famous bard in Mull, and had died only a few years ago. He could neither read nor write. She read and translated two of them; one a kind of elegy on Sir John Maclean's being obliged to fly his country in 1715; and another a dialogue between two Roman Catholic young ladies, sisters, whether it was better to be a nun or to marry." Both of these poems are in Dr. Maclean's MS. The last mentioned comes first, and the first mentioned immediately after it. Now, in this very manuscript there are 48 lines composed about Ailean nan Sop in the year 1517, 213 lines composed by Iain Lom in the year 1645 or shortly afterwards, and 357 lines composed by Eachann Bacach about the year 1651—in all, 618 lines one hundred years old and more. It is probable, however, that Dr. Johnson never thought of asking Miss Maclean whether she had any old poems or not. Looking upon the Gaelic as "the rude speech of a barbarous people who had few thoughts to express," he took for granted that its poetry could not have been preserved.

A. MACLEAN SINCLAIR,
Springville, Nova Scotia.



NOTES AND NEWS.

IN active zeal for the preservation and study of the Gaelic language no Society of Gaels can surpass the Gaelic Society of London. Following up a resolution passed at one of their meetings in October last, to the effect that "it is desirable in the course of next year to hold a Conference at some convenient place to consider important questions affecting Highland Education generally, and in particular the Orthography and Grammar of the Gaelic language," the Society has issued on the subject a circular to other Gaelic Societies and to individuals interested in Highland Education and the teaching and study of Gaelic. The circular, after a narrative of the circumstances and resolutions which gave it rise, says and says well: "Something certainly requires to be done that the youth of the Highlands may have the full benefit of our educational advancement, and at the very least the option of some instruction in their mother tongue." The circular concludes with the request that the Society or individual addressed should in the reply state: "(1.) Whether you consider such a Conference practicable and likely to serve a good purpose. (2.) The general questions and the points of grammatical detail you think should be considered at such Conference. (3.) Any special matter you would like to bring before such Conference; and whether you would do so personally. (4.) When and where you consider such Conference should take place."

WE think that if the Conference cannot do good, it certainly can do no harm. Whether it could do good would depend on the qualifications of its individual members. If the Society could get together the leading Gaelic scholars, who are, alas! not very numerous, some good could be done in exchanging views on educational matters and in devising a scheme of instruction in the mother tongue. The matter of orthography is one that cries for some reform, and, if the Conference could come to some finding on that point, it would certainly make instruction in the Gaelic language comparatively easy. In fact, teachers must have a uniform orthography. And in regard to points of grammatical detail, we should strenuously move for reduction in the use of the apostrophe, for nothing so disfigures a page and nothing is so difficult to teach in the matter of its use. Inverness appears to be the most suitable place for such a Conference, for there in summer many Gaels from all parts put in an appearance.

IN connection with Education in the Highlands, we are glad to see that the Rev. Mr. Mackenzie, Kingussie, has received a well-merited LL.D., and, in conferring this honour on Mr. Mackenzie, the University of Aberdeen has shown its usual interest in educationalists and teachers, and its thorough *rapproch* with matters educational in the Highlands. Dr. Mackenzie is also an old student of the Aberdeen University, or rather of old Marischal College. To Dr. Mackenzie, more than any other single individual, do we owe the extent and character of the late changes in the Scotch Code as bearing on the Highlands; and his efforts in Secondary Education have been unceasing.

THE 28th number of the *Revue Celtique* appeared last month. This completes its seventh volume. It was started in 1870 by M. Gaidoz, who most ably conducted

it to the end of the 6th volume in 1885. The seventh volume has been edited by M. D'Arbois de Jubainville, with the help of MM. Loth, Ernault, and Dottin. The result of so much collaboration is evident in the volume, for we have an index given to the words discussed throughout its pages, and there is further an index extending to 41 pages of the contents of the first six volumes. The 28th number contains only two papers, the first being a "Fragment of the Mabinogi of Gereint Ab Erbin," edited, from a MS. belonging to the old Hengwrt collection, by M. Loth and Mr. M. J. Evans. In the second paper M. Robert discusses the Voltino inscription and its interpretations. There is an admirable "Chronique," or, as we call it, "Notes and News," in which the *Transactions of the Inverness Gaelic Society* and the *Celtic Magazine* are spoken of, the former of which is briefly reviewed, and the latter, it is announced, will be reviewed in the next number. The papers in the Gaelic Society's *Transactions* mentioned are those of Professor Mackinnon ("the work of a true linguist"), Mr. Macbain ("an interesting study"), and Mr. Colin Chisholm. "*Le Celtic Magazine* est en bonnes mains," it says.

DR. NIGEL MACNEILL gave an interesting paper on "Brigit, the Mary of the Gael," to the Gaelic Society of London on March 9th. Brigit is our modern *Bride* in Gaelic and *Bridget* in English. Brigit, the daughter of Dubhach, a mortal and a saint, who doubtless was a real personage, got irretrievably mixed up with Brigit, the goddess, daughter of the Dagda (the Gaelic Jove). The goddess was the Gaelic Minerva and Vesta rolled in one, a fire-goddess and queen of poetry. The British goddess *Brigantia* is likely the same, not necessarily the abstraction of a territorial goddess from the tribe name Brigantes. The root of the word Stokes refers to that of Eng. *bright*, while Rhys and Jubainville refer it to the root of Gaelic *brigh* (strength). St. Brigit's life-history and the rites of her monastery were both taken largely, if not wholly, from the story and worship of the ancient fire-goddess.

PROVOST MACANDREW read, before the Gaelic Society of Inverness, on the 23rd March, an important paper on the "Picts." He dealt first with the obscure subject of the Picts of Ireland and of Galloway, and showed how unsatisfactory the records and historians were in regard to them. Whether they were the same as the Picts of Northern Scotland was not decided. The division of the Picts into Northern or Transmontane Picts and Southern or Cismontane Picts, the Provost considered misleading, for they were the same people. He discussed the name Pict, and argued that they were so called because Latin authors insisted that they tattooed themselves, which they did not, the Provost maintained. The name Cruithne was a Gaelic rendering of Pict (painted). The language they spoke was Gaelic. They were a Celtic—a Gaelic—people. The Provost scouted the idea of community of wives as a classical calumny, but allowed that the Pictish law of succession is a difficulty. The paper evoked a learned and lively discussion, the Provost's theory that the Picts were Gaelic-speaking being especially animadverted upon.